

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALEKSANDAR KAVCIC,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
BROADCOM INC., et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 20-cv-01246-JD

**THIRD ORDER RE SEALING**

Broadcom has filed three sealing requests, Dkt. Nos. 123, 125, 145, to redact (1) references to email communications designated by Broadcom as privileged or confidential, and (2) references to the amount of money that plaintiff Kavcic received in a prior settlement, which is derived from a document that non-party Carnegie Mellon University has designated as Highly Confidential. Broadcom's sealing motions are again perfunctory and devoid of meaningful analysis. *See* Dkt. No. 59 (order denying sealing requests). The requests to seal Carnegie Mellon's confidential information are also procedurally improper. In our District, a party who wishes to redact another party's designated confidential information must file an Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Another Party's Material Should be Sealed. *See* Civ. L.R. 79-5(f)(5).

This is not the first time that Broadcom has violated the Local Rules with respect to sealing applications. In the related patent case, the Court expressly advised Broadcom, which is represented in both cases by the same counsel, that it would "restrict or bar the opportunity to file future motions to seal if a party shows again an inability to conform to the governing standards, the local rules, or the Court's orders." *Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. LSI Corp.*, No. 18-CV-04571-JD, 2020 WL 5592992, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 18, 2020). Broadcom has flouted all three.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

JAMES DONATO  
United States District Judge